



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,625	08/21/2001	Chatschik Bisdikian	YOR920010520US1	6413
54856 7590 01/16/2007 LOUIS PAUL HERZBERG 3 CLOVERDALE LANE MONSEY, NY 10952			EXAMINER BAYARD, DJENANE M.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/16/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/933,625		BISDIKIAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Djenane M. Bayard		2141	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 10/25/06 in which claims 1-37 are pending.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said selected at least one service uses" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " said at least one service agent " in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " said software " in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " said software" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " said software" in line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " said software" in line 19. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Art Unit: 2141

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 27-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7, 092699 to Hefter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735619 to Sawada..

1. As per claims 1, 27- 30, Hefter teaches a service interaction method for a user to interacting with at least one remote service accessible through a home data distribution network, said home data distribution network comprising an aggregation of at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol used access said at least one remote service from a serving entity, the step of interacting comprising: employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN, said user connecting a serving entity attached to said home data distribution network using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network (See col. 4, lines 43-54, col. 9, lines 34-54). However, Hefter fails to teach obtaining and viewing a least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols; selecting said at least one remote service from said list; selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that said selected at least one service uses; and accessing and viewing said least one remote service in obtaining desired results.

Art Unit: 2141

Sawada teaches a home network gateway apparatus and a home network device.

Furthermore, Sawada teaches obtaining and viewing a least one remote service from accessible remote services from said serving entity accessible remotely via said home network from said serving entity using least one of said communications media and one of said communications protocols (See col. 1, lines 39-43, col. 2, lines 16-50); selecting said at least one remote service from said list (See col. ; selecting said at least one communications media and at least one communications protocol that said selected at least one service uses; and accessing and viewing said least one remote service in obtaining desired results (See col. 4, lines 45-56).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make remotely control home devices available using wide-area network such as the internet (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

2. As per claim 2, Hefter teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein the client device is portable (col. 4, lines 43-45).

3. As per claim 31, Hefter teaches a broadband network with enterprise wireless communication systems for residential and business environment. Furthermore, Hefter teaches an apparatus attaches on a home network for a user using a client device attached to a wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network, to interact with at least one service on said home network, said apparatus comprising: a telephone modem to directly receive an incoming call from a client device ( See col. 7, lines 1-20), and also to receive and transmit data over a

Art Unit: 2141

telephone network, said telephone modem having a client port through which the apparatus attaches to the telephone network (See col. 9, lines 33-57), said apparatus being a single apparatus through which a use with the user client device can establish communication in one step, said client device employing only one of a cellular voice network and a PSTN (See col. 4, lines 45-53); a dial-in service module to implement dial-in logic for the client device; and a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back and forth between a browser application in the client device and a browser server module (See page 2, paragraph [0014]). However, Hefter fails to teach a browser server module for managing data for remote display and a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back.

Sawada teaches managing data for remote display and a protocol transport module to implement protocols needed to transport data back (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

4. As per claim 32, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as describe above. However, Hefter teaches wherein said browser server is used to obtain, organize, and manipulate data received from and data sent to the client device through the protocol transport module (See col. 8, lines 5-10).

5. As per claim 33, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described

Art Unit: 2141

above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device.

Sawada teaches wherein said data sent to the client device are displayed and viewed by the browser application in the client device. (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

6. As per claim 34, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device.

Sawada teaches wherein said data sent includes a list of services that are accessible by the client device (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

7. As per claim 35, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hefter fails to teach wherein said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the

Art Unit: 2141

selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through the client port.

Sawada teaches wherein said data received by the browser application in the client device include a selection of at least one service the user of the client device controls and an action to be taken for a selected service, and upon receipt of the action the browser server interacts with a particular service agent to implement the control logic for controlling the selected service, wherein a control signal generated by the service agent exits the apparatus through the client port (See col. 2, lines 20-49).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34).

8. As per claim 36, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein said dial-in server module triggers at least one particular module in the apparatus to process any incoming calls and requests from a client device (See col. 9, lines 33-55)

9. As per claim 37, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein said dial-in server module performs user authentication (See col. 9, lines 11-25)



Art Unit: 2141

5. Claims 3- 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 7,092,699 to Hefter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 735,719 to Sawada as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 988,070 to Kawasaki et al.

1. As per claim 3, Hefter in view of Sawada teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Hefter teaches wherein the client device is a cellular telephone (See col. 4, lines 43-45); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up directly to the serving entity (See col. 9, lines 34-35); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up directly to the serving entity; wherein the viewing device depicts information in a form including at least one of: text, graphics, images, light display, or any combination of these (See col. 5, lines 46-51); wherein the step of connecting includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network to which the serving entity is connected (See col. 9, lines 33-55); wherein the data network is the Intranet controlled by an Internet Service Provider; wherein the data network uses the TCP/IP protocol suite for transporting information (See col. 7, lines 46-63); wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a first generation, analog, cellular network; wherein said wireless, circuit-switched, voice telephony network is a second generation, digital cellular network (See col. 5, lines 25-45); wherein the step of dialing-up directly to the service entity further includes passing dialing signaling and control data to the serving entity through an intermediary data network (See col. 9, lines 33-55); wherein the step of dialing-up to the serving entity through a data network, further includes dialing-up to the serving entity through a sequence of at least one data network, the last one of which the serving entity is attached to (See col. 9, lines 33-55); wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software

Art Unit: 2141

module executable on a computer; serving entity employing attributes of said circuit switch network in authenticating said user, wherein said attributes include a telephone number of said client device, and wherein said attributed include a telephone number of said serving entity (See col. 9, lines 33-55); establishing credentials so that said at least one remote service can be manipulated in a secure manner on the serving entity (See col. 9, lines 11-26); the serving entity providing access to at least one service agent used to access and control said at least on remote service (See col. 9, lines 11-26) ; However, Hefter fails to teach wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer; wherein the step of viewing the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privilege to said at least one remote service, activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service ; activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service

Sawada teaches wherein at least one of said at least one service agent is a computer software module executable on a computer; wherein the step of viewing the list on a viewing device in a manner that depends on the user's access privilege to said at least one remote service (See col. 2, lines 16-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sawada in the claimed invention of Hefter in order to make remotely control home devices (See col. 1, lines 30-34). However, Sawada fails to explicitly teach activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service ;

Art Unit: 2141

activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service.

Kawasaki et al teaches activating said software module prior to invoking a particular remote service ; activating said software module on demand after a particular remote service has been invoked; storing said software module at a data repository; and dynamically retrieving and activating said software module from the data repository after invoking a particular remote service (See col. 3, lines 36-40 and col. 5, lines 19-29).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kawasaki et al in the claimed invention of Hefter in view of Sawada in order to manage home appliances through the telephone network (See col. 5, lines 19-29).

2. As per claims 4-26 see claim 3 above.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2141

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M. Bayard whose telephone number is (571) 272-3878. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner

  
**RUPAL DHARIA**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**